

REMARKS

The Office Action dated 22 February 2006 has been fully considered by Applicants.

Attached herewith is a Three-Month Extension of Time and a Request for Continued Examination, along with a check in the amount of \$905 to cover the fees. If for any reason additional fees are required, please charge Deposit Account No. 08-1500.

Claims 1 and 10 are currently amended. Claims 2-3, 5, and 8-9 have been previously presented. Claims 4, 6 and 7 have been previously canceled.

Claims 1-3, 5 and 8-10 have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over United States Patent No. 5,930,512 to Boden et al in view of United States Patent No. 5,745,901 to Entner et al. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 1 has been currently amended to include the steps of creating a plurality of process models, each including a plurality of elements in a process driven information system, the plurality of elements represents work carried out by personnel of an organization, the models forming a component of a hierarchical arrangement of cross referenced processes; using the models to identify requirements for software application and information support components for the process; finding or creating one or more software application and information support components as support for said processes; deploying the process-driven information system, each element giving access to the software application or information support component; and selecting by a user one of a plurality of process models, to display the selected process model on a screen to access the software application and information support components to direct the operation of the software application and information support components and wherein a plurality of elements for the selected process model are provided in a tool which uniquely identifies each of the plurality of elements and which

maps each of the plurality of elements to an application and information in the form of one or more software components so as to allow user access from the process model displayed on the screen to the one or more software components and wherein the user access of a particular software and information support component is achieved by the user interacting with the display screen to select, via a user selection tool, one of the plurality of model process elements graphically displayed to the user on the screen at that time and for the selected process model, whereupon the software application and information support component linked to the selected model process element is generated on screen for use by the user, the models accessed by a web browser and which links the model elements in the browser by uniquely identifying each element and corresponding web page and for each process model which is selected for display and interaction via the display screen, a plurality of elements are displayed on the display screen with the elements which are displayed on each instance of a user selection of a process model dependent upon the particular process model which has been selected and the elements which have been previously linked thereto.

Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Examiner Wood has indicated that the '901 Entner et al patent discloses what is lacking in the '512 Boden et al patent, that is, the provision of a graphical interface with which a user can interact. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Applicant's invention is directed toward a graphical interface for a series of models, which themselves are not to be processed but rather are provided to facilitate the processing of work and the provision of information within an organization. In contrast, the '901 Entner et al patent is concerned with the processing of objects in a particularly efficient manner.

The method of the Entner et al patent (as described in Col. 3, lines 29-57) is, first, a user stores an object to be processed in a computer memory. The object is a self-contained module of data, such as text, graphics, sound or the like. The object is then read from the memory and a graphical symbol is added which is then processed using middle-ware in accordance with business rules that have been set up. The object in the '901 Entner et al patent is then processed in accordance with the business rules, i.e., the state of the same is changed and the object may then be printed, e-mailed or the like, in accordance with a range of options. This is an importance difference from Applicant's invention.

The '901 Entner et al patent is all about the ability to retrieve from memory a specific object and then process that object in isolation from the other objects. Indeed, even the Col 5 extracts referred to by Examiner Wood make it clear that the aim of 901' Entner et al is for a user to be able to retrieve one object, display details of that object on screen and select to process that object in one of a range of selected ways. The range of specific ways is NOT related selected for that object but rather is a range of options which are available for each object, i.e. the options which are displayed are the same for each object. Thus, in the '901 Entner et al patent, the aim is to effectively process each object independently by providing a graphical interface.

In accordance with Applicant's invention, the aim is to provide a range of process models. These models are not objects which are self-contained, as specified in the '901 Enter et al patent, but rather Applicant's range of process models are provided as a means to facilitate the processing of items of work, the provision of information, or so on. To do this a user of Applicant's invention can selectively access one of those process models, and a range of elements or tools which have been previously selected as being of use to that particular model are graphically displayed. These

elements are typically those from a wider range of elements which have been selectively linked to the process model as being appropriate for that process model. Thus, in Application's invention, the process model elements displayed for selection are directly related to each of the process models and only those of relevance to a selected process model are displayed at any given time.

Examiner Wood has indicated that because Entner et al shows a graphical model being generated that it would be obvious to combine this with Boden et al and arrive at Applicant's current invention. However, Entner et al has no suggestion that the graphical interface created would be anything other than a range of options which are available to allow the processing of an object, regardless of the object which is selected. In Applicant's current invention, the graphical interface created is entirely dependent upon the process model which has been created and therefore is in contrast to Entner et al, which would not provide the required flexibility for the selective display of elements depending upon the process model chosen. Clearly these features are not taught or suggested in a combination of the '512 Boden et al patent with the '901 Entner patent. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejection.

Step (f) of Applicant's claim 10 has been currently amended to include that the previous steps (a)-(d) are periodically repeated in a review cycle in which the process models and resources are revised and republished as a new version and each of the process models which is available for selection comprising a plurality of elements and when one of the process models is selected for display on the display screen, all of the elements for that model are displayed on screen and the elements which are displayed upon each selection of a process model are selected with respect to that selected process model and vary from process model to process model.


Applicant believes that currently amended claim 10 is novel over the cited references for the reasons as stated above with reference to currently amended claim 1 and, therefore, respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejection.

The remaining claims 2-3, 5, and 8-9 are dependent on currently amended claims 1 and 10 and believed allowable for the same reasons.

It is believed that the application is now in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited. If any further issues remain, a telephone conference with the Examiner is requested. If any additional fees are required, please charge Deposit Account No. 08-1500.

HEAD, JOHNSON & KACHIGIAN

Respectfully submitted,



Mark G. Kachigian
Registration No. 32,840
Head, Johnson & Kachigian
228 West 17th Place
Tulsa, Oklahoma 74119
(918) 587-2000
Attorneys for Applicant

Date: 22 August 2006